

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General  
RUDOLF M. D'SILVA (Bar No. 16227)  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Nevada  
Office of the Attorney General  
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
(702) 486-3375 (phone)  
(702) 486-3773 (fax)  
Email: rdsilva@ag.nv.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants  
Michael Minev and Jessica Rambur*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KEVIN GILL,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00360-MMD-CSD

**ORDER GRANTING  
MOTION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO  
FILE MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT  
(FIRST REQUEST)**

Defendants Michael Minev and Jessica Rambur, by and through counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General for the State of Nevada, and Rudolf M. D'Silva, Deputy Attorney General, hereby request to extend the time to file their dispositive motion by forty-five (45) days, **from February 27, 2025, to April 13, 2025.**

**I. POINTS AND AUTHORITY**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 16(b)(4), a party may request modification of the Court's scheduling order "only for good cause and with the judge's consent." *See also* LR 26-3 ("A motion or stipulation to extend any date set by the discovery plan, scheduling order, or other order must... be supported by a showing of good cause for the extension").

To demonstrate good cause under 16(b)(4), the party seeking modification must show "that, even in the exercise of due diligence, [the party was] unable to meet the timetable set forth in the order." *Cruz v. City of Anaheim*, CV1003997MMM/JEMX, 2011 WL 13214312, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2011) (citing *Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison*

Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002); *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)). Prejudice to the opposing party is a factor in determining good cause, though lack of prejudice is “not a prerequisite.” *Id.*

Defendants seek a first extension to file their motion for summary judgement. Good cause is present to grant an extension of forty-five (45) days to file a dispositive motion.

The dispositive motion deadline for this case is set for February 27, 2025. ECF No. 18 at 6:13-17. Counsel for Defendants’ is diligently working towards filing a motion for summary judgment by this date. However, due to undersigned counsel having several deadlines converging around the same timeframe in other cases along with working on discovery responses in other cases, undersigned counsel does not believe he will be able to meet the February 27, 2025, dispositive motion deadline.

The short extension requested by Defendants will enable counsel to complete his analysis of the numerous orders, pleadings and papers in this case necessary to formulate a motion for summary judgment. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that the extension be granted for good cause. *See Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1260, (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that the “district court abused its discretion in denying party’s timely motion” to extend time because the party “demonstrated the ‘good cause’ required by Rule 6, and because there was no reason to believe that [the party] was acting in bad faith or was misrepresenting his reasons for asking for the extension”). **Defendants request an additional forty-five (45) days, or until April 13, 2025, to file motion for summary judgement.**

Undersigned counsel contacted counsel for co-defendant who informed undersigned counsel that they would not oppose a request for an extension of time.

DATED this 24th day of February, 2025.

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General

By: /s/ Rudolf M. D’Silva  
Rudolf M. D’Silva (Bar No. 16227)  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

**ORDER**

The deadline to file a motion for summary judgment is now April 13, 2025.  
IT IS SO ORDERED.  
Dated: February 25, 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE